

Parcel 273-000036 **Address** 38 W Bridge St **OHI** N/A

Year Built: 1965	Map No: 116	Photo No: 1792-1795 (7/10/16)
Theme: Government	Historic Use: Post Office	Present Use: Vacant
Style: Modernist Movement	Foundation: Poured concrete	Wall Type: Brick
Roof Type: Flat	Exterior Wall: Brick	Symmetry: No
Stories: 1	Front Bays: -	Side Bays: -
Porch: Flat roof supported by metal posts on southeast corner	Chimney: None visible	Windows: Fixed aluminum-frame display windows, & awnings

Description: The one-story brick building has a rectilinear footprint and a flat roof. The west half of the facade has a projecting stone-faced wall, with a glazed entrance on its east side. The east half of the façade is glazed by aluminum-framed display windows and sheltered by a flat-roof porch. Awning windows are used on the side elevations, and a loading dock is on the rear of the building.

Setting: The building is located on the north side of W Bridge St in the old village center of Dublin. A flag pole is in front of the building, and a paved parking lot extends between the building and street.

Condition: Good

Integrity:	Location: Y	Design: Y	Setting: Y	Materials: Y
	Workmanship: Y	Feeling: Y	Association: Y	

Integrity Notes: The building has excellent integrity.

Historical Significance: The building is within the boundaries of the City of Dublin’s local Historic Dublin district. The property is recommended as a contributing resource to the recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase, which is more inclusive of historic resources in the original village.

District: Yes	Local Historic Dublin district	Contributing Status: Recommended contributing
National Register:	Recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase	Property Name: N/A



38 W Bridge St, looking northwest



38 W Bridge St, looking southeast



BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, January 25, 2023 | 6:30 pm

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

2. **Franklin Street Extension Project - Landscaping at 50 W. Bridge Street** **22-179MPR** **Minor Project Review**

Proposal: Modifications to landscaping on private property in association with the Franklin Street Extension Project.

Request: Review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Brian Gable, Deputy Director of Engineering – Design and Construction

Planning Contact: Sarah T. Holt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner

Contact Information: 614.410.4662, sholt@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/22-179

MOTION 1: Ms. Cooper moved and Ms. Damaser seconded, to approve the Waiver to allow the black, vinyl-coated, chain-link fence improvement.

VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The Waiver was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Gary Alexander	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Martha Cooper	Yes
Michael Jewell	Yes
Hilary Damaser	Yes

MOTION 2: Mr. Jewell moved and Ms. Damaser seconded, to approve the Minor Project.

VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The Minor Project was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Gary Alexander	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Martha Cooper	Yes
Michael Jewell	Yes
Hilary Damaser	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Sarah T. Holt

89A2805342A848D
Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA
Senior Planner





MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, January 25, 2023

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the January 25, 2023, meeting of the City of Dublin Architectural Review Board (ARB) to order at 6:31 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Chair led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Mr. Cotter, Mr. Jewell, Ms. Cooper, and Ms. Damaser
Staff present: Ms. Holt and Ms. Goliver

CHAIR COMMENTS

~~Mr. Alexander noted that the second case on the agenda - 22-179MPR, Minor Project Review, Franklin Street Extension Project – Landscaping may not require a presentation if nothing has changed since the last presentation and could be reviewed first.~~

~~Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Jewell seconded, to consider the Franklin Street Extension Project, first.
Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Motion Carried 5 - 0]~~

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

~~Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Jewell seconded, to accept the documents into the record and to approve the minutes from December 14, 2022.
Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Motion Carried 5 - 0]~~

CASE PROCEDURES

The Chair stated the Architectural Review Board is responsible for the review of construction, modifications or alterations to any site in the area subject to the Architectural Board Review (ARB) under the provision of Zoning Code §153.170. This Board has the final decision-making responsibility on cases under their purview. Anyone who intends to address the Board on any of the cases this evening will be sworn in. There were no cases eligible for the Consent Agenda. The agenda order is typically determined at the beginning of the meeting by the Chair, but the cases in the minutes will still follow the order of the published agenda.

~~they bought the lot from him. The neighbor wants the process expedited and the street to get back to normal. He stated he was not an architect but the design is pretty cool. He understands the driving forces of the historic nature of the neighborhood but it is a river view lot and would like to take advantage of that. Most of the houses there have decks and such and maximize the number of windows that face the river. He said it is to be historic looking on the front but a river view feel on the back. It does not seem to be a typical lot.~~

~~Mr. Johnson – For context, the rear façade at 134 - 136 S. Riverview Street, next door, appears clearly as a three-story house based on the topography.~~

~~The Chair – The Board does not dispute the rear is going to be taller, more open, with the amount of windows proposed; there are more sensitive ways it can be handled.~~

~~(Q3) Mr. Cotter – The stone in the front is fine. He wanted to better understand the wraparound.~~

~~Ms. Damaser and Mr. Jewell had the same concern.~~

~~Mr. Alexander – Stepping should be simpler.~~

~~Mr. Johnson – He suggested adding a chimney to connect to.~~

~~Ms. Holt – Chimneys cannot project into a setback.~~

~~Mr. Johnson – To limit materials, all board and batten would be removed and just have stone and horizontal siding.~~

~~Mr. Cotter – He inquired about the window size and placements on the south side.~~

~~Mr. Alexander – The consultant commented on the variety of windows and grid pattern changes.~~

~~Ms. Holt – She agreed there is a variety and interpreted the comments of wanting traditional forms and groupings, not randomly placed on the exterior as dictated by the interior.~~

~~Ms. Cooper – She inquired about the little window that appears between floors.~~

~~Mr. Johnson – A small eye window in a bathtub/shower area in the bathroom.~~

~~Ms. Cooper – She asked about the one above by the gable.~~

~~Mr. Johnson – There's a switchback stairway and the landing is dropped down from the second floor.~~

The Chair summarized the Board's comments:

- ~~• The mass and scale is related to the articulation of the rear elevation. The 3.5 story mass on the one plane in the rear needs to be reduced.~~
- ~~• Simplify the conceptual character and detail to be more appropriate using vernacular detail for a traditional home.~~
- ~~• Simplify rooflines.~~
- ~~• Reduce the number of materials to two but a third might be permitted if used as an accent.~~
- ~~• Organize the windows on the elevations where the windows do not appear to line up. Create some continuity in the grid patterns in the windows, themselves.~~

2. Franklin Street Extension Project - Landscaping at 50 W. Bridge Street 22-179MPR, Minor Project Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for modifications to landscaping on private property in association with the Franklin Street Extension Project from the City of Dublin Department of Engineering.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated just the improvements on private property were going to be discussed. An aerial view was shown of the proposed road extension with the associated project site within two different zones. The

Historic District, Historic Core is on the east side of Franklin Street, and Historic District, Historic Public is on the west side where the school is located. Darby Street Public Parking Lot and J. Liu's Restaurant is to the east, to the south is Bridge Street, and the library garage is to the north. The existing chain link fence was noted in one of the photographs taken along Franklin Street. There are three different project areas:

The first area is at the School. Emerald City Tulip Trees are proposed for along the newly-relocated access drive. The current fence will be replaced with a new black, vinyl-coated chain-link fence and screened with compact size Pfitzer Junipers in the new location. A Waiver has been requested as chain-link fencing is not normally permitted in the district.

The second area is at J. Liu's Restaurant, where a drive aisle and parking spaces were previously located. A variety of shrubs, small trees, and foundation plantings have been proposed. Two small walls will be added on each side of the entry drive to match other walls to match those at the Darby Street Public Parking Lot.

The third project area is at the Darby Street Parking Lot. A variety of small trees, shrubs, and grasses, (listed in the Planning Report) will be installed to screen the parking lot and utilities.

The majority of the Waiver Approval Criteria have been met or are not applicable. Overall, this is an improvement to the area. The application was also reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria, which have been met. Planning recommends approval of both the Waiver and the Minor Project without conditions.

Questions for Staff

There were none.

Applicant Presentation

The Chair determined the Board could make a determination on this case without further presentations, which Mr. Gable agreed to.

Questions for the Applicant

There were none.

Public Comment

There were no public comments received.

Board Discussion

The Chair determined the Waiver was sufficiently discussed at the last meeting and called for a motion to approve the Waiver.

Ms. Cooper moved and Ms. Damaser seconded, to approve the Waiver to allow the black, vinyl-coated, chain-link fence improvement.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Motion Carried 5 - 0]

Mr. Jewell moved and Ms. Damaser seconded, to approve the Minor Project.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Motion Carried 5 – 0]

The Chair affirmed the Minor Project was approved.

The Chair indicated Cases three and four will be presented together.

~~3. Mothballing Historic Roofs at 40 E. Bridge Street, 27, 37, 53, and 62 N. Riverview Street, 23-003MPR, Minor Project Review~~

~~The Chair stated this application was a request for mothballing of historic property roofs in association with the North Riverview Street Project from the City of Dublin Facilities Division. The sites are zoned Historic District, Historic Residential and located north of E. Bridge Street and between N. Blacksmith Lane and N. Riverview Street.~~

~~4. Carport Demolition at 40 E. Bridge Street, 23-004ARB, Architectural Review~~

~~The Chair stated this application was a request for Demolition of a non-contributing structure/carport at an existing home on a 0.319-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is located northeast of the intersection of N. Blacksmith Lane with E. Bridge Street.~~

Staff Presentation

~~Ms. Holt stated these two cases are part of the larger, N. Riverview Project and presented the sites involved [aerial view]. West of N. Riverview Street is zoned Historic Residential, east of N. Riverview is zoned Historic Public, and to the west of the project it is zoned Historic Core. The address of 40 E. Bridge Street is part of both applications. The structure's roof will be repaired and carport demolished. Not included properties involve like-for-like maintenance related to standing-seam, metal roofs.~~

~~In January 2021, the City purchased all these properties for redevelopment opportunities. In April 2021, Council appointed an Advisory Committee who indicated support to create a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the project. In June 2022, the RFP was advertised. In September 2022, the Advisory Committee recommended a proposal to City Council, which was accepted. The City is currently working with the chosen developer.~~

~~Photographs were shown of the five properties with the deteriorating structures all in fair to poor condition as reported by CTL Engineering in 2020. The structure at 40 E. Bridge Street is suffering interior damage due to leaks. The non-compliant and non-contributing carport was shown for the demolition request for 40 E. Bridge Street.~~

~~The application was reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria. Staff recommended approval with the following condition:~~

- ~~1) This temporary solution may be required for longer than six months, the projected lifespan of the proposed materials. At that time, the condition of roof felt shall be examined, and replacement may be necessary based on condition and the timeline of the N. Riverview Properties project.~~



BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, April 27, 2022 | 6:30 pm

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

**2. Fox in the Snow at 38 W. Bridge Street
22-034MPR**

Minor Project Review

Proposal: Exterior modifications to an existing building on a 0.29-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Core.

Location: Northwest of the intersection of W. Bridge Street with Darby Street.

Request: Review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

Applicants: Andrew Rosenthal, GRA+D Architects; and Jason Liu, Shanghi Enterprises, LLC.

Planning Contact: Taylor Mullinax, Planner I

Contact Information: 614.410.4632, tmullinax@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/22-034

MOTION 1: Mr. Jewell moved and Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the first Waiver:

1. §153.173(I)(10) Alternative Screening Requirement: In lieu of compliance with the requirements of §153.173(I), an alternative approach to accommodate unique site conditions may be approved if the required reviewing body determines that the proposed alternative achieves the aesthetic, environmental, and screening results as well or better than compliance with the standards of §153.06(I).
Request: To permit the use of extruded aluminum material for roof mechanical equipment screening.

VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The Waiver for alternative screening was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Gary Alexander	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Martha Cooper	Yes
Michael Jewell	Yes
Hilary Damaser	Yes

MOTION 2: Mr. Jewell moved and Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the second Waiver:

2. §153.174(D)(1) Windows Requirement: Windows shall be wood, metal-clad wood, or vinyl-clad wood. The ARB may approve other high quality synthetic materials with examples of successful, high quality installations in comparable climates.
Request: To permit the use of steel framed windows.



**2. Fox in the Snow at 38 W. Bridge Street
22-034MPR**

Minor Project Review

VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The Waiver for a window made of a different material was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Gary Alexander	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Martha Cooper	Yes
Michael Jewell	Yes
Hilary Damaser	Yes

MOTION 3: Ms. Damaser moved and Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the Parking Plan as follows:

A total of 30 spaces is required for this site. 18 spaces are on site including 1 ADA space with the additional 12 spaces obtained through a Shared Parking Agreement with 50 W. Bridge Street, J-Liu Restaurant. Both businesses are owned by the same person so patrons to each establishment will have access to all spaces combined.

VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The Parking Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Gary Alexander	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Martha Cooper	Yes
Michael Jewell	Yes
Hilary Damaser	Yes

MOTION 4: Mr. Cotter moved and Ms. Cooper seconded, to approve the Minor Project with five amended conditions:

- 1) That the dumpster enclosure be fully screened within two years;
- 2) That the applicant shall work with Staff on the window muntins on the east elevation to better respond to the architectural style of the building. The window divisions on the east and south elevations do not need to match;
- 3) That the applicant continues to work with Staff to provide south elevation windows that could incorporate muntins in a way that is consistent with the existing character of the building;
- 4) That all items, which require maintenance, repair, or replacement, include but are not limited to, the rear awning, gutters and downspouts; and chipping paint will be fully addressed to the City's satisfaction, within one year; and



**2. Fox in the Snow at 38 W. Bridge Street
22-034MPR**

Minor Project Review

- 5) That the applicant works with Staff to administratively approve any color changes to the awning on the north elevation.

VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The Minor Project was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Gary Alexander	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Martha Cooper	Yes
Michael Jewell	Yes
Hilary Damaser	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Taylor Mullinax

D9CF1A1C484149E...
Taylor Mullinax, Planner I



~~Ms. Cooper~~ Clarified that Mr. Alexander was saying the professional with experience in a Historic District will understand the guidelines that are in place. And in this case, the consideration of a subordinate structure, which was discussed at the last meeting, and again today, is still something the Board believes is viable. As a Board, we have not seen enough evidence to support the demolition, as Mr. Alexander has expressed.

~~Mr. Alexander~~ As a courtesy, the Board was explaining the applicant has the option to table the case this evening. The applicant proving a demolition is warranted is going to be very difficult.

~~Mr. Cotter~~ The Code lays out reasons for a demolition and asks what the risks are if a demolition cannot be approved.

~~Ms. Lyon~~ She was concerned if this was an equal process for everyone and would not have to be a "Cazillionaire" to find success in the process. She asked why there is not a designated architect that the Board prefers for the Historic District and pay them to consult, pay them to conduct a tutorial, or have a website that any architect could go to and glean from. She believed she was at a disadvantage for not having unlimited funds.

~~Ms. Damaser~~ She told Ms. Lyon that she appreciated her frustration, but applicants and architects alike have access to the Zoning Code and it contains all the information needed. Therefore, any architect could be selected.

~~Ms. Lyon~~ There were just seven items in the Code that addressed renovations. Such as the roofline cannot be above the roofline of the original structure. Even though that is in the Code, it may not be true. Three materials are prohibited for additions and one is concrete block. She said that was the significant material used on their original house. At the last meeting, she had asked if the Board would be willing to speak with her architect that was in attendance. Mr. Kramb had stated that is not what the Board does. She stated it was not that they have not tried to find some common ground without having to change their original architect they had selected.

~~The Chair~~ There is not much more the Board can say. The applicant has the option to table the case. If the Board votes down the demolition, the applicant can still do an addition or renovation, drawings would be required.

~~Ms. Lyon~~ Chose to table and come back another time.

~~Ms. Damaser moved and Ms. Cooper seconded, to Table the Demolition request for 143 S. Riverview Street at the request of the applicant.~~

~~Vote: Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes, and Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Tabling Approved 5-0]~~

~~Mr. Cotter~~ Asked Ms. Holt if there was a process in the Code to appeal whether a structure should be contributing or not.

~~Ms. Holt~~ Confirmed that is part of the Code.

~~Mr. Cotter~~ Pointed out to the applicant there is a process, if she chose to appeal whether a structure was contributing.

(Cases 2 and 3 were heard together)

2. Fox in the Snow at 38 W. Bridge Street, 22-034MPR, Minor Project Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for exterior modifications to an existing building on a 0.29-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Core. The site is northwest of the intersection of W. Bridge Street with Darby Street.

3. Fox in the Snow at 38 W. Bridge Street, 22-042MSP, Master Sign Plan

The Chair stated this application was a request for the installation of a ±19-square-foot wall sign for an existing building zoned Historic District-Historic Core. The 0.29-acre site is northwest of the intersection of W. Bridge Street with Darby Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mullinax stated a review and approval was being requested for a Minor Project Review for exterior modifications and a Master Sign Plan for a wall sign, both at 38 W. Bridge Street. She presented an aerial view of the site that included 63 feet of frontage along W. Bridge Street and surrounded by commercial uses. The existing International Style building was built in 1965 and originally served as a U.S. Post Office until 1982. The masonry building features a stone accent wall and a covered entryway on its front façade [current photograph shown]. The building was recommended contributing (HCA 2017). The same entity owns this property as well as the one next door at 50 W. Bridge Street where the J-Liu restaurant is located. The applicant has proposed a coffee shop for the 2,958-square-foot building, along with a unique sign concept, which is the Fox in the Snow's brand. The front of the building faced W. Bridge Street and the rear faced Wing Hill Lane [photographs shown]. Additional existing conditions for the site [photographs] included the east elevation, which faced the Dublin Veterinary Clinic, and the west elevation that faced the J-Liu restaurant.

Minor Project Review

Proposed modifications on the Site Plan included adding landscaped islands throughout the site and replacing dying plants in the existing planted islands. Restriping and reconfiguring the existing parking will include the parking spaces where the ADA parking is located while repairing the ADA ramp. The flag pole and bollards near the front entry will be removed.

Parking required for this site to contain an eating and drinking establishment is 30 parking spaces; 18 spaces are proposed on the site with an additional 12 spaces obtained through a shared parking agreement with 50 W. Bridge Street, J-Liu restaurant. Both sites are owned by the same person so all patrons will have access to the combined spaces between both properties. Staff is in favor of the Parking Plan as presented.

On the south elevation, the applicant proposed to add:

- New steel frame windows and a front entry door (requiring a Waiver);
- Muntins to the storefront windows;
- Cedar planks to the ceiling of the covered entry to address water damage; and
- A trellis system on the existing stone façade to help create the applicant's signature sign concept.

The applicant also proposed to paint the gas meter to match the stone façade to conceal this utility.

Staff supported a Waiver for the steel material. Staff and the City's preservation architect who consulted on the project, did not recommend adding muntins to the storefront windows. The reason cited was "Adding muntins would take away from the simple material aesthetic of the glass, and changing the window proportions alters the overall material composition."

On the east elevation, the applicant proposed to:

- Enlarge the existing opening of the horizontal ribbon window and add muntins;

- Add a new window to the left of the existing window opening

Staff was supportive of using two horizontal rows of windows that match the existing, where the stone sill is retained/repeated, to best honor the architecture.

Staff was not supportive of the muntins as proposed; rather, Staff recommended the muntins be diminished so that they are less visible.

Staff did not support the window opening as its form is not architecturally appropriate for the International Style of architecture.

On the north elevation, the applicant proposed to:

- Clean, repair, or replace the existing blue awning. If replacement is needed, this item will be administratively approved by Staff; and
- Remove the existing non-compliant flood light.

The applicant proposed the following materials and colors:

- RTU screening made by Industrial Louvers, Inc. is an extruded aluminum product, in an anodized clear color to match the era of the building;
- Cedar for the front entry ceiling;
- A&S Steel frame windows and door;
- Jakob GreenGuide Trellis;
- Hubbell Sling Series of lighting for the east elevation;
- 'Repose Gray' paint for the gas meter and piping, which matches the stone;
- 'Rockwood Terra Cotta' paint for the electric meter box and downspout that matches the brick;

Staff supported the Waiver for the Industrial Louvers for RTU screening and the window and door materials proposed.

An approval was recommended for two Waivers:

1. §153.173(I)(10) Alternative Screening Requirement: In lieu of compliance with the requirements of §153.173(I), an alternative approach to accommodate unique site conditions may be approved if the required reviewing body determines that the proposed alternative achieves the aesthetic, environmental, and screening results as well or better than compliance with the standards of §153.06(I).

Request: To permit the use of extruded aluminum material for roof mechanical equipment screening.

2. §153.174(D)(1) Windows Requirement: Windows shall be wood, metal-clad wood, or vinyl-clad wood. The ARB may approve other high quality synthetic materials with examples of successful, high quality installations in comparable climates.

Request: To permit the use of steel framed windows.

An approval was recommended for the Parking Plan as follows:

A total of 30 spaces is required for this site. 18 spaces are on site including 1 ADA space with the additional 12 spaces obtained through a Shared Parking Agreement with 50 W. Bridge Street, J-Liu restaurant. Both businesses are owned by the same person so patrons to each establishment will have access to all spaces combined.

An approval was recommended for the Minor Project with five conditions:

- 1) The site circulation will change with the impacts of the Franklin Street improvements. Within two years, the owner of the properties at 38 and 50 W. Bridge Street, this tenant, and the City, shall make a joint application for a Minor Project to address parking layout, parking space sizes, and circulation; pedestrian circulation; bike parking; landscaping and screening; and dumpster location(s) and required screening at the time of the Franklin Street extension project on both properties;
- 2) If the Franklin Street site circulation project (condition 1) is not completed within 2 years, the dumpster enclosure must be fully screened;
- 3) The square window on the east elevation shall not be approved and muntins on the south façade shall not be approved. The applicant shall work with staff on the arrangement of the horizontal ribbon window on the east elevation, including muntin design, to better respond to the architectural style of the building;
- 4) All items which require maintenance, repair, or replacement, which include but are not limited to, the rear awning, gutters and downspouts, and chipping paint will be fully addressed to the City's satisfaction, within one year; and
- 5) That the applicant work with Staff to administratively approve any color changes to the awning on the north elevation.

Master Sign Proposal

The applicant proposed a 10-square-foot, dimensional wall sign for the front elevation that faced W. Bridge Street located at a height of 6 feet, 4 inches from grade to the top of the sign, and would be mounted to the existing stone wall with 4-inch stainless steel stand-offs attached at the mortar joints. The custom aluminum, powder-coated green sign features a fox painted with white highlights to accentuate the features of the fox, appearing to be diving into the snow for food. There is no dimensional lettering of text, which is the brand image. The fox will be halo-lit from behind, encircled with Boston Ivy, which was part of the tenants brand image. This wall sign would provide visual interest and vibrancy to the streetscape as shown at the other locations. The proposed wall sign deviated from the Code due to its size, custom aluminum sign material, and the fox as the brand image in lieu of dimensional lettering.

An approval was recommended for the Master Sign Plan with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant apply for permanent sign permits through Building Standards, prior to installing the wall sign.

The future City project - Franklin Street Extension was relative to tonight's discussion but not part of this application. Franklin Street is due to be extended west of 50 W. Bridge Street, starting construction in the spring of 2023. Staff is working with the property owner (Jason Liu) and the City regarding the site changes including parking and circulation of both sites. The changes will NOT affect the shared parking agreement between the two sites. The owner, future tenant, and the City of Dublin will submit a joint ARB application for future site modifications for both sites at the appropriate time.

Questions for Staff

Mr. Alexander – Inquired about the Staff’s request for the muntins to be less visible. He asked if that meant Staff wanted less muntins used or thinner muntins?

Ms. Taylor – Staff deferred to the architect.

Mr. Alexander – Requested further clarification on the windows.

Ms. Taylor – Staff supported the steel to be used instead of the existing aluminum but would like the overall storefront form to remain.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Rosenthal – Introduced himself as the architect for the applicant. Staff comments make this sound easier than it is. As architects, we are very aware of the International Style of architecture. The first design shared with the client and Staff was definitely reflecting of the International Style and would have been easy to approve. The client did not support that design for their type of business. The design provided in the packet to the Board is what the client ideally wants to have, which is clearly not the International Style of architecture. Lots of people want the steel windows as they are very substantial and nice but there are not many that want to pay the higher price for it. He has looked over this property with many clients over the past four or five years. Their proposal is probably the closest fit from what they have seen, however not a perfect fit. The client would like to replicate the Fourth Street location. His client understood what Staff was proposing was more relevant or accurate to the International Style but what the client proposed was very high quality and could be reversed to the original post office if desired in the future. Something has to be done. The existing door was not original, just insulated glass but all the other glazing was original single pane and anyone would have to replace it with something. From an energy perspective, whoever takes this building over will need to replace the windows. The east façade makes sense for a post office needing a blank wall but probably would not be desired by any other use on Bridge Street. This is where architecture meets commerce. The question is how much the Board will allow deviation from the original structure to accommodate this user or push it down the road and hope to find someone who is willing to use the building closer to what it was originally.

Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Cotter – Windows were on the east façade to aesthetically bring light into the building.

Mr. Rosenthal – He was not clear on what Staff was recommending.

The Board was also unsure of the expectations.

Mr. Jewell – The east façade would be important to a business that would need light in the morning. He understood adding more windows period, due to the type of business it was proposed to be.

Mr. Alexander – Inquired about the purpose of the proposed square window Staff had said should not be approved on the east elevation.

Mr. Rosenthal – To get more light into the intended dining room space and leave the existing header intact. That was the remaining piece that had some flexibility to it from the client’s perspective. There was a fundamental question on the table, which was what the Board could or could not live with more of an industrial sash than what would have been typical on this structure in the 60s. Staff has been great to work with and very helpful but he did not have much confidence that there was a solution that both the client and Staff could live with or what the consultants would agree to.

Mr. Alexander – Suggested a design with less grids. He had visited the Fox in the Snow on North 4th Street. He asked if there was a middle ground because this architect is good.

Mr. Rosenthal – They have drawn many iterations. His client has said if this does not work for Dublin, they will find a different location to do what they wanted to do.

Mr. Alexander – He was concerned with the proposal with suspending a line of brick for this long strip and having a window up high and one down below. Constructability of that would be a major challenge and would look peculiar as an architect/designer.

Public Comment

There were no comments submitted by the public but Mr. Holton wished to address the Board.
Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, said he was happy to see something happening with the old post office as it had been vacant for 10 years. He requested clarification on the proposal. He asked if a trellis was planned for the whole stone façade to which Ms. Mullinax answered affirmatively. He suggested not doing that as this was a historic building as the first permanent post office in Dublin. It is a treasure, even though people may not see it that way. Before 1965, Dublin did not have a post office, the services moved from building to building, which is pointed out on tours, etc. that this is an important building in Dublin's history. If the trellis is as important as he understood it from the presentation, and part of the identity for the brand, as the ivy is incorporated into the logo. He asked that the trellis only be incorporated behind the logo and not over all the stone. He clarified the logo is proposed at 10 square feet in size, which is larger than what the Code permits.

The Chair – Answered he understood why Staff was okay with the size given other things that have been approved at this size and larger.

Mr. Holton – Requested the size be reduced.

Board Discussion

The Chair – Suggested going through each motion and conducting the discussion for each item. The first motion are the two Waivers for mechanical equipment and steel windows. The Waiver is just for the material of the windows, not the design.

Mr. Jewell moved and Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the first Waiver as part of the Minor Project:

1. §153.173(I)(10) Alternative Screening Requirement: In lieu of compliance with the requirements of §153.173(I), an alternative approach to accommodate unique site conditions may be approved if the required reviewing body determines that the proposed alternative achieves the aesthetic, environmental, and screening results as well or better than compliance with the standards of §153.06(I).

Request: To permit the use of extruded aluminum material for roof mechanical equipment screening.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Mr. Cotter, yes.
[Approved 5-0]

Mr. Jewell moved and Ms. Damaser seconded, to approve the second Waiver related to the Minor Project:

2. §153.174(D)(1) Windows Requirement: Windows shall be wood, metal-clad wood, or vinyl-clad wood. The ARB may approve other high quality synthetic materials with examples of successful, high quality installations in comparable climates.

Request: To permit the use of steel framed windows.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; and Mr. Jewell, yes.
[Approved 5-0]

Ms. Damaser moved and Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the Parking Plan for the Minor Project as follows:

A total of 30 spaces is required for this site. 18 spaces are on site including 1 ADA space with the additional 12 spaces obtained through a Shared Parking Agreement with 50 W. Bridge Street, J-Liu restaurant. Both businesses are owned by the same person so patrons to each establishment will have access to all spaces combined.

Vote: Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Approved 5-0]

The Chair – Asked if the last condition could be approved without the owner present. He was not comfortable that the owner was not present to speak to any of the conditions. He asked Mr. Rosenthal if he and the owner have had any discussions about this specifically.

Mr. Rosenthal – He was only aware that Staff had definitely communicated with the owner and there is general consensus around of what the possibilities are because the City's plans are somewhat in flux.

Ms. Holt – The last condition can be stricken for now but the owner has met with Planning, Engineering, Transportation and Mobility early last week and they discussed this as a concept for the overall site improvements. We all have a good understanding of what needs to happen and that can be worked out separately as part of the Franklin Street Extension.

Mr. Cotter moved and Mr. Jewell seconded, to approve the Minor Project with five amended conditions:

- 1) That the dumpster enclosure be fully screened within two years;
- 2) That the applicant shall work with Staff on the window muntins on the east elevation to better respond to the architectural style of the building. The window divisions on the east and south elevations do not need to match;
- 3) That the applicant continues to work with Staff to provide south elevation windows that could incorporate muntins in a way that is consistent with the existing character of the building;
- 4) That all items, which require maintenance, repair, or replacement, include but are not limited to, the rear awning, gutters and downspouts; and chipping paint will be fully addressed to the City's satisfaction, within one year; and
- 5) That the applicant works with Staff to administratively approve any color changes to the awning on the north elevation.

Vote: Mr. Jewell, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; and Mr. Cotter, yes.
[Approved 5-0]

Ms. Mullinax – The Master Sign Plan needed a motion and vote.

The Chair – Asked if the sign needed discussion since the public requested some changes. He asked if the trellis was part of the sign.

Ms. Mullinax – The trellis was not included in the calculation but it was part of their brand and identity for the Fox in the Snow.

Mr. Cotter – The sign concept covers the historic stone wall but it is reversible; he had no major opposition to the sign proposal.

Ms. Cooper – The trellis adheres to the stone on the front.

Mr. Rosenthal – That was not historically accurate and was discussed with Staff. Boston Ivy was not super invasive as far as ivies go. Typically, the client would let the ivy grow up the wall and trim it around the sign from time to time.

Mr. Alexander – Using a trellis attached to the mortar joints preserves and protects the building.

Ms. Damaser – With this wire trellis, the stones will still be visible and see the frontage that is important.

Mr. Jewell – The halo lighting will also help reveal the stone.

Mr. Alexander – In terms of the size of this, the mural has been approved for the fairy garden compared to this is enormous. The intent that is part of the zoning is to have more creative, decorative, and better signs.

Ms. Damaser moved and Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the Master Sign Plan with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant apply for permanent sign permits through Building Standards, prior to installing the wall sign.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Approved 5-0]

There was a quick break.

Ms. Holt read into the record another public comment for 143 S. Riverview Drive. Since the determination has been made, on the advice of the attorney, it is acceptable to read it into the record, now. The bottom line was this resident was in support of the demolition.

~~4. Dublin Arts Council at 7125 Riverside Drive, 22-036MPP, Minor Project Review~~

~~The Chair stated this application was a request for the reconstruction of a historic log cabin relocated to this site with associated site improvements on a 1.5-acre site zoned Restricted Suburban Residential. The new site is northwest of the intersection of Riverside Drive with Emerald Parkway.~~

~~Staff Presentation~~

~~Ms. Holt presented an aerial view of the site which is outside the Historic District but listed on Appendix C as a historic property. A closer aerial view showed both properties, which the City owned since 1999. It became the site for the Dublin Arts Council in 2002. The historic site is the Krumm Home built in 1941 and is individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places [photograph]. The cabin we are speaking of was originally found during an extensive renovation project on Riverside Drive in 2017. It was cited as part of Thaddeus Kosciuszko land grant and dates from 1820-40. When the cabin was found during this demolition/renovation project, it was seen as something very unique and therefore it was disassembled, all the logs were numbered, and has been in storage ever since.~~

~~In August 2021, City Council unanimously agreed to relocate the cabin to property of the Dublin Arts Council. The cabin was specifically meant to be a small event venue and provide an educational opportunity for visitors to the site. The proposed site location for the cabin is just southwest of the main building [photograph]. The cabin originally sat on a sloped site to accommodate a root cellar or basement. The proposed siting here specifically replicates the unique, original placement. This project is just the first phase of a three-phase project to include more outdoor spaces and river access. The site plan showed what is coming. Tonight, we are just looking at the cabin relocation, parking upgrades to add ADA spaces, and a pathway to the cabin and historic root cellar.~~